UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/701,029	11/04/2003	Brian Grove	G&C 30074.50-US-U1	6164	
	7590 07/24/200 DDLE & REATH	EXAMINER			
	LECTUAL PROPERT	SHIFERAW, ELENI A			
ONE LOGAN SQUARE 18TH AND CHERRY STREETS			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
PHILADELPH	PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-6996			2136	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/24/2008	PAPER	

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/701,029	GROVE ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	ELENI A. SHIFERAW	2136
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the main earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fror ute, cause the application to become ABANDON	N. imely filed in the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31     This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)☑ Th     Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal matters, pr	
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 34,36-49,51-64 and 66-78 is/are pe 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdi 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 34,36-49,51-64 and 66-78 is/are rej 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and  Application Papers	rawn from consideration.	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) and a specificant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	ccepted or b) objected to by the ne drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is old	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applica iority documents have been receiv au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail [5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:	Date

Art Unit: 2136

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 34, 36-49, 51-64 and 66-78 are presented for examination; claims 1-33 are non-elected and/or withdrawn.

#### Election/Restrictions

2. Claims 1-33 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 09/28/2007.

## Response to Amendment/amendment

- 3. The amendments to claims 34, 49 and 64 in view of claim objections last office action page 2 is accepted and objections are herein withdrawn.
- 4. Regarding argument the reference(s) failure to disclose wherein the host fingerprint F is computed at least in part from host information C and/or the host information C that is computer processor serial and/or model number and/or hard drive serial/model number and/or MAC address, remark page 19, argument is not persuasive because these information are not claimed and "detected internal data NNNNN" of Iijima is terminal device/host information.
- 5. Regarding arguments on page 20, argument is moot in view of new grounds of rejection below.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 1 O1

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Art Unit: 2136

7. Claim 49, and 51-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because it is directed to non-statutory subject matter as failing to fall within a statutory category and as being directed to software per se (although the preamble of claim 1 recites a "An apparatus" it does not inherently mean that the claim is directed to a machine). The specification also describes, on page 8 lines 13-page 9 lines 20 the means for retrieving, generating and transmitting as software. Therefore, claims 49, and 51-63 are software per se. See MPEP 2106.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 9. Claims 34-35, 38-44, 49-50, 53-59, 64-65, and 68-74 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iijima USPN 5225664 in view of Ho et al. US PG Pubs 20030143989 A1.

Regarding claims 34, 49 and 64, Iijima discloses a method/apparatus of authenticating a hardware token (*IC card 1*) for operation with a host (*terminal device 8*), comprising the steps of:

retrieving a value X (col. 4 lines 42-64; C2X) from a memory accessible to an authenticating entity, the value X generated from a computer fingerprint F (internal data NNNNN) of the host (col. 4 lines 42-50 and col. 3 lines 64-67) and an identifier P securing access to the token, wherein the host fingerprint F is computed at least in part from host information C

(col. 4 lines 42-49 and col. 4 lines 21-26; internal data NNNNN,... random number...card number/SN);

generating the identifier P at least in part from the value X and the fingerprint F (col. 4 lines 55-63 and lines 42-49; C2 is generated by encrypting random data B using key data NNNNN); and

transmitting the generated identifier P to the token to authenticate the token for operation with the host (col. 4 lines 64-col. 5 lines 23; *C2 is transmitted to IC card for authentication*).

Iijima fails to disclose regenerating the same identifier value P at least in part from the value X and the fingerprint F and transmitting the regenerated identifier P.

However Ho et al. discloses generating a new same identifier based on received information and comparing the new identifier with received identifier and communicating based on comparing result (see par. 26, claim 27 and fig. 3 element 320, 370, 380, and 395).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Ho et al. within the system of Iijima because they are analogous in authentication. One would have been motivated to modify the teachings to provide proper access based on authentication.

Regarding claims 38, 53 and 68, Iijima discloses the method/apparatus, wherein the value X is computed in the token (col. 4 lines 42-49).

Regarding claims 39, 54 and 69, Iijima discloses the method/apparatus, wherein the value X is computed according to X=f(P,F), wherein f(P,F) is a reversible function such that f(f(P,F),F)=P

Art Unit: 2136

(col. 3 lines 56-col. 4 lines 64).

Regarding claims 40, 55 and 70, Iijima discloses the method/apparatus, wherein f(P,F) comprises P XOR F (col. 3 lines 56-col. 4 lines 64).

Regarding claims 41, 56 and 71, Iijima discloses the method/apparatus, wherein the value X is further computed at least in part from a user identifier U (col. 2 lines 43-62).

Regarding claims 42, 57 and 72, Iijima discloses the method/apparatus, wherein the value X is computed according to X=f(P,U,F), wherein f(P,U,F) is a reversible function such that f(f(P,U,F),U,F)=P (col. 3 lines 56-col. 4 lines 64).

Regarding claims 43, 58 and 73, Iijima discloses the method/apparatus, wherein f(P,U,F) is P XOR U XOR F (col. 3 lines 56-col. 4 lines 64).

Regarding claims 44, 59 and 74, Iijima discloses the method/apparatus, wherein: the authorizing entity is a host computer communicatively coupleable to the token; and the value X is stored in the host computer (fig. 1 elements 1 and 8).

10. Claims 45-48, 60-63, and 75-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iijima USPN 5225664 and Ho et al. US PG Pubs 20030143989 A1 and

further in view of Miura USPN 6952775 B1.

Regarding claims 45, 60 and 75, Iijima fails to disclose hashing. However Miura discloses the method/apparatus of IC card 103 authentication (see fig. 1) and the authentication comprising hashing multiple entity's personal information (see fig. 6-7), storing the computed hash value (col. 2 lines 64-col. 3 lines 7). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Miura within the combination system to compute a hash value of value x because computing a hash value of authenticating data is well known at the time of the invention for authentication.

Regarding claims 46, 61 and 76, Miura discloses the method/apparatus of IC card 103 authentication (see fig. 1) and the authentication comprising hashing multiple entity's personal information (see fig. 6-7), storing the computed hash value (col. 2 lines 64-col. 3 lines 7). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Miura within the combination system to compute a hash value of in part from the fingerprint F; and retrieving the value X associated with the reference value H because computing a hash value of authenticating data is well known at the time of the invention for authentication.

Regarding claims 47, 62 and 77, Miura discloses the method/apparatus of IC card 103 authentication (see fig. 1) and the authentication comprising hashing multiple entity's personal information (see fig. 6-7), storing the computed hash value (col. 2 lines 64-col. 3 lines 7).

Art Unit: 2136

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Miura within the combination system to compute a hash value of in part from the fingerprint F; and retrieving the value X associated with the reference value H because computing a hash value of authenticating data is well known at the time of the invention for authentication.

Regarding claims 48, 63 and 78, Miura discloses the method/apparatus of IC card 103 authentication (see fig. 1) and the authentication comprising hashing multiple entity's personal information (see fig. 6-7), storing the computed hash value (col. 2 lines 64-col. 3 lines 7). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Miura within the combination system to compute a hash value of in part from the fingerprint F; and retrieving the value X associated with the reference value H because computing a hash value of authenticating data is well known at the time of the invention for authentication.

11. Claims 36-37, 51-52, and 66-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iijima USPN 5225664 and Ho et al. US PG Pubs 20030143989 A1 and further in view of Ayyagari et al. 2003/0208677.

Regarding claims 36, 51 and 66, Iijima teaches wherein the host fingerprint F is computed at least in part from host information C (see col. 3 lines 56-col. 4 lines 64) but fails to disclose wherein the host fingerprint F is computed at least in part from a server specific value V. However Ayyagari et al. discloses identifier information comprising a concatenated hardware

Art Unit: 2136

address of the access server and a hardware address of a client. There fore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Ayyagari et al. with in the combination system because they are analogous in authentication. One would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings to include the remote server within the authentication.

Regarding claims 37, 52 and 67, Iijima teaches wherein the host fingerprint F is computed at least in part from host information C and a fixed string Z (see col. 3 lines 56-col. 4 lines 64) but fails to disclose wherein the host fingerprint F is computed at least in part from a server specific value V and a fixed string Z. However Ayyagari et al. discloses identifier information comprising a concatenated hardware address of the access server and a hardware address of a client. There fore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Ayyagari et al. with in the combination system because they are analogous in authentication. One would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings to include the remote server within the authentication.

#### Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eleni A. Shiferaw whose telephone number is 571-272-3867. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00am-5:00pm.

Art Unit: 2136

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser R. Moazzami can be reached on (571) 272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Eleni A Shiferaw/

Art Unit 2136